

Succession Planning and Implementation in Libraries:

Practices and Resources

Kiyomi D. Deards
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA

Gene R. Springs
The Ohio State University, USA

A volume in the Advances in Library and
Information Science (ALIS) Book Series



Information Science
REFERENCE

An Imprint of IGI Global

Managing Director:	Lindsay Johnston
Production Manager:	Jennifer Yoder
Development Editor:	Erin O'Dea
Acquisitions Editor:	Kayla Wolfe
Typesetter:	John Crodian
Cover Design:	Jason Mull

Published in the United States of America by
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey PA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@igi-global.com
Web site: <http://www.igi-global.com>

Copyright © 2014 by IGI Global. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher. Product or company names used in this set are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Succession planning and implementation in libraries : practices and resources / Kiyomi Diane Deards and Gene R. Springs, editors.

pages cm

Summary: "This book provides valuable insight into the process of implementing succession planning in libraries, delving into the challenges and possibilities of a succession plan's effect on the success of library organizations for human resources officers, library administrators, academicians, and others"-- Provided by publisher.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4666-5812-7 (hardcover) -- ISBN 978-1-4666-5813-4 (ebook) -- ISBN 978-1-4666-5815-8 (print & perpetual access) 1. Library personnel management. 2. Library personnel management--United States. 3. Librarians--Recruiting. 4. Mentoring in library science. 5. Library planning. 6. Manpower planning. 7. Career development. I. Deards, Kiyomi Diane, 1978- editor of compilation. II. Springs, Gene R., 1978- editor of compilation.

Z682.S895 2014

023--dc23

2013050655

This book is published in the IGI Global book series Advances in Library and Information Science (ALIS) (ISSN: 2326-4136; eISSN: 2326-4144)

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: eresources@igi-global.com.

Chapter 3

Mentoring for Retention, Promotion, and Advancement: An Examination of Mentoring Programs at ARL Institutions

Gene R. Springs
The Ohio State University, USA

ABSTRACT

Mentoring can play a key role in the career development of librarians. Formal mentoring programs are often available for students enrolled in graduate library and information science programs, for early career professionals through a variety of professional associations, and for librarians at the institutions in which they work. The goals of these mentoring programs may vary, and can range from orientation to promotion or retention and even to advancement. Using the 115 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) academic members as a population, this chapter examines the mentoring practices that may be in place at these institutions by closely reading and analyzing the existing mentoring documentation that was available on their Websites. In all, 22 ARL institutions had mentoring documentation available for analysis. The findings indicate that a large majority of the mentoring programs studied have defined orientation and promotion as their main objectives, while far fewer make any mention of advancement or leadership development as their objectives. Further research is recommended to study both formal and informal mentoring opportunities at ARL institutions.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-5812-7.ch003

INTRODUCTION

Mentoring is a commonly accepted practice in the field of librarianship. Library organizations, be they individual libraries or professional associations, have myriad mentoring options available to aid in the orientation, retention, promotion, and advancement of librarians. Mentoring can take place in a variety of ways, through formal programs, such as traditional mentoring where a seasoned professional is matched with a nascent professional in a one-on-one dyad, or through structured group and peer mentoring. Additionally, a combination of formal and informal mentoring may also take place depending on the objectives and local practices for a given library organization. Informal mentoring can also occur, where a person seeks out mentors from a variety of sources, including colleagues, administrators, or peers within or outside their organization (Zabel, 2008). At its core, mentoring provides a framework for both institutional best practices and knowledge to be passed down from a more experienced member (the mentor) of an organization to a newer one (the protégé), while also presenting the opportunity for career development for those new to an organization (Kram, 1985). Aside from the potential benefits inherent in the mentoring relationship whereby the mentor may experience satisfaction in aiding a colleague or renewing a purpose in the profession, and whereby the protégé may be acculturated and promoted, mentoring pro-

grams can benefit the library organization as a whole through orientation and retention (Lee, 2011).

In academic libraries, formal mentoring programs are often geared toward new employees, intending to guide them through the tenure or promotion process (Murphy, 2008). This, in essence, is a retention strategy, ensuring that new librarians receive guided support to fulfill the requirements for tenure or promotion that often include: independent research, scholarly publications, and service to professional associations, the library in which they work, and to the institution of higher education which they serve (Wilson, Gaunt, & Tehrani, 2009). Since requirements for tenure or promotion can vary by institution, each formal mentoring program can be unique and tailored to the practices and needs of each particular library organization. In addition to retention, some academic library organizations may leverage mentoring programs as tools for succession planning; focusing on advancement within the organization by fostering the development of leadership and management skills. This chapter will examine each Website of the 115 academic institutions of the Association for Research Libraries (ARL), to determine if any information on formal mentoring programs can be found. If so, what are the main objectives of the formal mentoring program, and is there any language in the objectives which could indicate advancement or leadership and management succession into the formal mentoring program?

BACKGROUND

Introduction

The topic of mentoring is both prolific and extensively found in the research and professional literature of library and information science. Examples from the research literature discussed in this section will focus on formalized mentoring programs at academic libraries. These programs fall into three main categories: traditional mentoring, peer or group mentoring, and hybrid mentoring models that combine elements of both of the preceding programs. The Additional Reading section at the end of the chapter contains a number of sources on mentoring, including those from other disciplines such as business, education, and human resources; this list is broader and more inclusive than the focus of the literature in this Background section.

In preparation of discussing the literature in the three categories previously described, there are two examples from the literature that concern mentoring in academic libraries from a more general or holistic perspective. Culpepper's review of the literature on mentoring academic librarians outlines and defines the major concepts of mentoring programs, including the process, participants (mentees and mentors), benefits, and pitfalls (2000). Culpepper stresses that a successful mentoring relationship depends on evaluation and feedback, so communication between participants is a major factor to consider in supporting programs. Neyer and Yelinek explore intergenerational communication, among other mentoring experiences, in their survey study aimed at academic librarians in

Pennsylvania (2011). Their findings indicated that respondents with a high rank status (library director, full or associate professor) were primarily from the Baby Boom generation, while librarians in positions with low rank were often from the NextGen or Generation X (Neyer & Yelinek, 2011). In traditional, one-on-one mentoring relationships, it is likely then that the mentor may be from one generation and the mentee or protégé from another. Members of distinct generations may have different views on work and communication styles which can be a challenge in developing mentoring relationships in an organization (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

Traditional Mentoring Programs

The library and information science literature contains numerous studies which discuss formal traditional mentoring programs in academic libraries. A targeted selection of these studies is contained herein. In 1999, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) examined formal mentoring programs in place at their member institutions. Through a survey study, Wittkopf determined that twenty-one ARL libraries had a formal mentoring program (1999). Libraries that indicated they had mentoring programs provided documentation of their programs, and a sample were included in Wittkopf's *Mentoring Programs in ARL Libraries: A SPEC Kit* (1999). The documentation provided includes policies, guidelines, checklists, and applications as appropriate (Wittkopf, 1999).

Two of the institutions included were further discussed in case studies that detail

the development, implementation, and assessment of their mentoring programs: the University of Delaware Library and Louisiana State University Libraries. Wojewodzki, Stein, and Richardson outline the process by which the University of Delaware Library developed and implemented its three-tiered formal mentoring program (1998). In order to meet the mentoring needs of librarians at various stages in their careers, different “levels” of formal mentoring were created: Level 1, short in duration, for new professionals or new librarians to the organization; Level 2, a career-stage level for experienced professionals interested in promotion to higher ranks; and Level 3, an advanced level for mid-career professionals aiming to develop skills for administrative positions (Wojewodzki et al., 1998, p. 4). Their study also discusses an assessment of the mentoring program, with feedback garnered from mentor and mentee evaluations; informal relationships continue after the formal mentoring relationship has ended, which the authors indicate as a measure of success (Wojewodzki et al., 1998).

The mentoring program discussed by Kupyier-Rushing at Louisiana State University (LSU) Libraries differs from the previous example as its focus is to help tenure-track librarians achieve promotion by meeting the requirements for tenure (2001). The author describes the development process LSU implemented to create their mentoring program, which included a survey to all library faculty designed to ascertain research and service interests, experiences and expectations of mentoring, and to identify persons with whom they could not work (Kupyier-Rushing,

2001). One challenge to assessing the success of the program included organizational volatility (several participants leaving LSU Libraries) (Kupyier-Rushing, 2001). Another challenge related to the stated goal of the program as helping mentees achieve tenure; there are multiple factors involved in tenure considerations, and it would be impossible to isolate the mentoring program on its own to determine its impact (Kupyier-Rushing, 2001).

Peer and Group Mentoring Programs

Unlike traditional mentoring, which relies on the one-on-one, mentor-to-protégé dyad, peer and group mentoring involves members that belong to different levels in an organization’s hierarchy. Peer mentoring is based on a multiple mentoring approach, where variety of experience contributes to a more holistic understanding of the organization and one’s place in it (Mavrinac, 2005). This approach allows greater flexibility for the mentor, mentee, and the organization as peer mentoring is more inclusive. Like traditional mentoring, training is necessary to define outcomes and outline expectations (Mavrinac, 2005).

Similar to the literature on traditional mentoring programs, much of the relevant literature on peer and group mentoring is based on case studies of individual library organizations. Fyn examines the development and implementation of a peer mentoring group at Bowling Green State University (BGSU) Libraries. Librarians new to BGSU discussed common interests at an initial meeting, and determined the research and publication process of peer-reviewed journal articles, as

a requirement for tenure, garnered the most interest (Fyn, 2012). Meetings held in a seminar style allowed for open-ended discussions on research interests; the representation from various library departments strengthened the group and allowed for greater collaboration (Fyn, 2012). “A peer mentoring approach diffused the workload and responsibilities related to tenure-track activities so that tenured colleagues and supervisors would not be overburdened by mentoring several individuals,” (Fyn, 2012, p. 334).

Lee discusses the research committee at Mississippi State University (MSU) Libraries, which organizes workshops and programming to support the research process of its librarians (2005). Over the course of one academic year, topics for workshops included the editorial review process, an overview of research resources available for use at MSU, and how to evaluate research articles; the meetings were informal and hands-on when appropriate (Lee, 2005). The committee co-sponsored a daylong retreat for untenured librarians, allowing the participants to discuss research issues without their supervisors in attendance; additionally, several more workshop topics were generated by the discussion (Lee, 2005).

Similarly, concerns about research and scholarship drove the creation of the Junior Faculty Research Roundtable (JFRR), a peer mentoring group at the City University of New York (CUNY) (Cirasella & Smale, 2011). Because of the dispersed nature of CUNY, members of the JFRR communicate both in person at meetings and events, and online via an email list (Cirasella & Smale, 2011). Through ongoing assessment using email

questionnaires, the group can be nimble to continue to meet members’ needs (Cirasella & Smale, 2011). One limitation to the peer mentoring group has been the campus- and college-specific requirements for tenure, a role that, as discussed above in the previous section, is addressed by the more traditional mentoring programs (Cirasella & Smale, 2011). However, Cirasella and Smale note that the community aspect of the JFRR counteracts the solitary nature of writing, aids in maintaining focus on members’ research projects, and provides opportunities for networking, learning, and collaboration (2011).

Henrich and Attebury discuss the creation and implementation of a Community of Practice (CoP) at the University of Idaho Library, whose primary function was to help each untenured librarian find his or her own path to tenure and promotion (2010). Like other peer mentoring models, membership in the CoP at University of Idaho was voluntary and diverse, from various library units; the programming involved time for discussion and allowed for collaborative opportunities (Henrich & Attebury, 2010). Assessment of the first year of the CoP was done through an informal survey; the majority of the members surveyed found the group to be beneficial to their professional development (Henrich & Attebury, 2010). Similar to the other models of peer mentoring mentioned above, the more informal nature of the group allows for speedy adjustments in response to feedback and assessment.

Lieberthal discusses peer mentoring in a retreat setting (2009). The junior faculty at Stony Brook University Libraries organize

a one-day retreat during which they present on-going research and practice upcoming conference presentations, participate in poster sessions, and end the day in a group discussion about the library where they can express their personal views in a supportive setting (Lieberthal, 2009). The learning and values developed as a group at the retreats “may influence the larger library organization and assist faculty to develop strategic goals” (Lieberthal, 2009, p. 38).

Hybrid Mentoring Programs

In her analysis of the human resources development literature, Murphy argues that traditional mentoring relationships, on their own, cannot develop “tomorrow’s library leaders,” as library career paths continue to rapidly evolve (2008, p. 434). Murphy identifies developmental relationships such as dialogue groups, networks, mentoring circles to facilitate ongoing learning throughout the course of one’s career, similar to the peer mentoring groups discussed in the prior section: “While the traditional hierarchical mentoring relationship does not necessarily need to be abandoned, its value in concert with other forms of developmental relationships resides in its ability to expose the individual to a wider variety of perspectives, experience, and tacit knowledge” (2008, p. 437). The following case study articles focus on hybrid mentoring models as they evolved at individual institutions to meet the changing needs of their employees.

Ghouse and Church-Duran provide a history of the mentoring program at the Uni-

versity of Kansas (KU) Libraries, tracking its initial use of traditional mentoring relationships for the purposes of promotion and tenure, to its eventual inclusion of all library faculty and staff in a blended, hybrid mentoring environment (2008). The first iteration of the mentoring program was based heavily on the model established by LSU Libraries (Ghouse & Church-Duran, 2008). Various assessments and administrative changes over several years provided the opportunity for the mentoring program to “shift from an emphasis on tenure and research support to an approach centered on fostering cultural awareness, confidence, building, and other developmental opportunities for the mentee” (Ghouse & Church-Duran, 2008, p. 382). This example is a glimpse into how one library organization remained flexible during a time of rapid organizational and administrative change, and modified their mentoring program to meet these newly identified needs.

Farmer, Stockham, and Trussell discuss the revitalization of a formalized mentoring program at Kansas State University (KSU) Libraries. Much like the initial mentoring program at KU Libraries, the primary goal at KSU Libraries was for promotion and tenure, and was achieved by matching a protégé to a mentor (2009). Consistencies in the quality of mentoring led to a revision of the goals of the mentoring program, and led to a focus on “the development of the person in all aspects of professional life,” not just in achieving promotion and tenure (Farmer et al., 2009, p. 10). Additionally, group mentoring was added for new employees, allowing them to communicate with each other along with

their assigned mentor. Assessment of the re-designed mentoring via survey indicated that the more holistic approach combined with the group mentoring was a success (Farmer et al., 2009).

When librarians were granted faculty status at the Z. Smith Reynolds (ZSR) Library at Wake Forest University, a new formal mentoring program was launched to offer different mentoring opportunities (Keener, Johnson, & Collins, 2012). The mentoring committee combined a traditional, one-on-one mentoring relationship with group mentoring to meet the diverse needs of librarians throughout the organization (Keener et al., 2012). Panel discussions led by ZSR librarians enabled peer-to-peer knowledge and information sharing; similarly, the creation of journal reading groups allowed those participating in the traditional mentoring relationships to read and discuss current mentoring literature and discuss its relation to their organizational development (Keener et al., 2012).

Bosch, Ramachandran, Luevano, and Wakiji describe the mentoring model created and implemented by the California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) library, the Resource Team Model (RTM) (2010). In the RTM, a new librarian to the CSULB library is matched with a triad of mentors, each of whom has expertise in a library function; it is short-term in nature (six months), and is intended to guide and support the new hire (Bosch, Ramachandran, Luevano, & Wkiji, 2010). The RTM structure with three experienced mentors allows for multiple perspectives to be heard by each mentee, which incorporates elements of group mentoring within a structure similar

to traditional mentoring relationships (Bosch et al., 2010). The authors also note that the RTM model is evolving and is in need of an expanded assessment component (Bosch et al., 2010).

Mentoring and Advancement

Examples of mentoring programs that have advancement or managerial training as a goal are sparse in the literature. Aside from the mentoring program detailed by Wojewodzki, Stein, and Richardson at the University of Delaware Library, which included in the a mentoring level specifically for experienced librarians looking to move into administrative positions, none of the other mentoring programs, traditional, peer and group, or hybrid, had advancement as a goal (1998). Wayman, Walker, & Shank detail the development of an Administrative Leadership Development Program (ALDP) at Pennsylvania State University (PSU) Libraries (2011). While not part of the organization's formal mentoring program, which emphasized promotion and tenure, the ALDP is an example of an initiative developed to meet the needs of future library leaders; its three main components include mentoring, fellowship, and leadership development training (Wayman et al., 2011). The ALDP mentoring component mirrors the tenure-track mentoring program in pairing an experienced library administrator with a librarian in a traditional mentoring relationship; goals of the program include "learning about administrative positions, developing leadership skills, becoming familiar with different leadership styles, building a network

of colleagues, and even determining whether an administrative is a right fit for him or her” (Wayman et al., 2011, p. 72). Group mentoring occurs in cohorts of librarians participating in the ALDP, so the mentoring component is a hybrid one.

While these are just two examples of mentoring programs that focus on advancement and leadership development, it may be argued that libraries, and in turn their mentoring programs, are on their way to redesigning their approach in a rapidly changing environment. Munde places mentoring programs within the framework of succession planning (2000). As library directors, administrators, and senior librarians retire, there is likely to be a vacuum of ready leaders in library organizations (Munde, 2000). Munde calls for organizational mentoring which aims to “achieve the organization’s leadership goals and meet its existing and future personnel needs, as opposed to programs using mentoring to provide staff orientation and tenure/promotion assistance;” furthermore, “existing programs do nothing to prepare employees for career advancement to higher positions, interim or otherwise, or for redeployment to other functional positions” (2000, p. 173). It is with these thoughts in mind that the study for this chapter was developed.

FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAMS AT ARL INSTITUTIONS

Methodology

Member institutions of ARL represent the largest research libraries in North America. The 115 academic institutions therein com-

prise the largest academic research libraries in North America, and are the population of this study.

Two different data sets have been analyzed for this study. The first is a set derived from Wittkopf’s 1999 *Mentoring Programs in ARL Libraries: A SPEC Kit*. Though by no means a representative sample of the population, the formal mentoring program documents of 9 academic member institutions gathered as part of this study provide an opportunity to analyze the language of these primary documents.

The second set is derived from Internet searches completed in September 2013. Here, the chapter author visited the Website of all 115 academic ARL institutions to search and browse for any documentation relating to a mentoring program. Search terms used in the library Website site search included the following: “mentor,” “mentoring program,” “orientation,” and “promotion.” Any library resources, such as books, journals, or articles that appeared in the search results were not counted, as the focus was on internal library documentation. If no documentation regarding mentoring programs were identified, the library Website was browsed under any sections titled “About Us,” “Staff Resources,” or “Human Resources.” When documentation regarding a formal mentoring program was found, the URL was saved and the documents were printed out. In all, 26 of the 115 academic ARL institutions were identified as having had mentoring content listed on its Website, through searching or browsing; documentation was saved, printed, and analyzed for 17 libraries, once Web pages with broken links, staff-only content, and little-to-no information were filtered out. The author decided

to not include the University of Minnesota's Institute for Early Career Librarians in this analysis, as this mentoring program is part of a separate institute, and not a mentoring program for University of Minnesota library employees only (University of Minnesota Libraries, 2011).

Once mentoring documentation was secured, a content analysis of each data set occurred to identify language related to advancement, leadership development, or managerial and administrative skills. Any variation of each of the preceding words identified in the documents was coded and further analyzed to discern any programmatic objective or component for mentoring for advancement. Other factors about the mentoring program, including goals, participants, and duration were noted for analysis as well.

The primary limitation of this study is that documentation for mentoring programs may not be publically available on the Website of a given ARL library. Information on mentoring programs may be secured on an internal intranet, or even disseminated via paper format or internal email. Given this limitation, the findings of this study should not be interpreted as comprehensive or definitive. Instead, they allow the opportunity to provide an analysis of general practices with regard to mentoring in ARL academic institutions.

A secondary limitation is that there may be other programs, be they formal or informal, related to mentoring or not, for the development of leadership or management skills that may lead to advancement opportunities within one of these libraries. For instance, the home institution of the author has a formal mentor-

ing program for pre-tenure library faculty that does not include any language on leadership, management, or advancement; however, all library faculty are able to apply for financial support to attend a leadership institute or workshop that is decided by a separate committee comprised of elected and appointed library faculty. While this is not a mentoring opportunity, per se, the institution is providing the opportunity elsewhere; so, any absence of language regarding leadership, management, or advancement should not imply that a library organization has no functional support for advancement.

RESULTS

ARL Mentoring Programs in 1999

In her 1999 study, Wittkopf discovered that 21 ARL institutions had a formal mentoring program. She included representative documentation for nine of these libraries (see Appendix). Eight of the nine libraries considered support for tenure and promotion as a goal of the mentoring program. Two of the nine libraries considered orientation to the library a goal in addition to tenure and promotion, while one considered orientation to be the only goal for the mentoring program. With these goals in mind, the duration of the mentoring programs varied; five libraries did not specify duration, two stated the duration would vary on the type of mentoring involved, one had a range of six months to two years, and one, the program focused on orientation, was limited to six months.

The mentoring programs for two of the libraries contained language that either clearly stated or implied that advancement, or managerial and leadership development were considered goals in the mentoring program. The University of Delaware, as described in the Background section above, is one of these two libraries. One of the three levels of mentoring available for librarians at the University of Delaware is devoted to experienced librarians who want to be mentored by administrators in the organization for career advancement (Wittkopf, 1999). The other library, at The State University of New York (SUNY) at Albany, does not have a separate track for advancement mentoring; instead the language is implied in a goals of the program to "...help them advance in their careers" (Wittkopf, 1999, p. 47). While it is not clearly stated that advancement itself is a goal, the language is inclusive.

ARL Mentoring Programs in 2013

Of the 17 libraries for which mentoring program documentation was publicly accessible (See Appendix), 10 of the libraries considered tenure and promotion, both retention activities, to be primary goals of the mentoring program, while four considered orientation, general career support, and professional development to be primary goals. The three remaining libraries had unique mentoring programs with more specific objectives. For instance, University of California, Riverside provides a Librarian & Information Specialist Mentor Program for members of the university community who are interested in pursuing librarianship as a profession; they are matched with current librarians at the University for mentoring and

advice (Ivy, 2013). Dartmouth College and the University of Toronto both have peer mentoring programs, but with different objectives. Both are informal in structure; Dartmouth College Library's peer mentoring program is for librarians who want support for instruction, teaching, and presenting (Dartmouth College Library, 2012). At the University of Toronto Libraries, a list of peer mentors is provided with their various interests; any mentor can be contacted and tapped as a mentor for an area of expertise he or she has identified (University of Toronto Libraries, 2013). These are the only examples of peer mentoring among the sample.

Only two libraries had mentoring programs that included language regarding advancement or managerial and leadership development. The first was the University of Delaware, which has kept its three-level approach to mentoring, with a dedicated mentoring option for experienced librarians aiming to be mentored by senior administrators (The University of Delaware Library Assembly of Professional Staff, 2009). The second example is not as clearly stated. The Cornell University Library's mentoring program aims to foster professional growth, which includes support for employees to "think broadly about career paths, refine career goals, and assess skills" (Cornell University Library Staff Web, 2009). This broadly written language, like the example from SUNY Albany in 1999, is inclusive, and may offer an interested employee the opportunity to find a mentor in the organization to foster advancement or managerial and administrative aspirations.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While it is difficult to draw concrete conclusions from the two data sets used for analysis in the study, due to them not being representative samples of the population of academic ARL libraries, some observations about mentoring programs may be useful for recognizing trends and developments in this area. For instance, providing support for attaining tenure and promotion remain the primary objectives of a majority of the mentoring programs analyzed from both 1999 and 2013. This support continues to be offered primarily in one-on-one, mentor-to-protégé relationships, as only two libraries in the 2013 group offered peer mentoring programs. These two programs, at Dartmouth College and the University of Toronto, had more specific objectives, perhaps not unlike many of the examples of case studies from the literature on peer and group mentoring.

It is of particular interest to see that the University of Delaware has maintained its three-program approach to mentoring over the course of 20 years. This was the one, definitive example of mentoring for advancement in both sets of documents, and from the literature. It is encouraging to see language of inclusion, or more broadly defined objectives and goals for mentoring programs, as was seen in SUNY Albany in 1999 and Cornell University in 2013, where mentoring for advancement could potentially be pursued.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Even though the literature on mentoring in library and information science is already considerable, both in breadth and depth, there are a few areas for future research that can address some lingering questions about mentoring. For one, a formal update to Wittkopf's 1999 study of ARL mentoring programs would be particularly useful. If the research could closely adhere to the initial study, including a survey and a call for documentation, a more scientific comparison could be made between practices then and now.

Another potential area for further research would be to study peer mentoring in academic libraries. Though a number of case studies, many addressed in this chapter, have been published, there is a need for a more systematic review of their presence, and goals and objectives, in academic libraries.

More research is needed on the role of mentoring in succession planning. This chapter addressed one part of this research question, by examining current practices at ARL libraries, but more in-depth research is needed to understand this relationship in a more holistic manner. If libraries are not mentoring future leaders in their organizations, is the mentoring occurring elsewhere? What are the opportunities available for experienced librarians who aspire to advance in their organizations? These are just a sample of potential research questions that build and expand upon this current study.

CONCLUSION

Mentoring remains an effective strategy to orient, develop, support, and retain librarians. The literature is comprised of numerous studies which point to the usefulness of mentoring, in whatever form that may take within individual organizations. Traditional mentoring, peer mentoring, or a hybrid model of both, are all in current practice as demonstrated by the literature and this study. Objectives and goals must be clearly defined, both for the program overall and for the individuals in the mentoring relationship.

This study examined the current mentoring practices of some ARL libraries. While the main purpose seems to still be for retention, in the form of support for tenure and promotion, there are examples of libraries that are flexible in their approach, to more holistically address professional development or organizational culture. The role of mentoring for advancement within an organization still remains unclear. While one library examined has a formal program in place, and another had inclusive language that may allow for this type of mentoring, there does not appear to

be a move toward leveraging mentoring for succession planning in individual institutions. This is concerning, as mentoring is generally designed to transit institutional knowledge from one person to another; incorporating it into succession planning would be a valuable way for an organization to not only grow its own leaders, but for these new leaders to have personal, first-hand knowledge of how their predecessors approached issues unique to their institution.

Additional research into the relationship between mentoring and succession planning is needed, especially as libraries face economic and demographic changes that may have an impact on recruitment and hiring in the future. Munde said it best: “literally, the next generation of library directors is currently working in the field...they should be able to expect mobility within the library’s structure, additional training, and experience outside their hiring positions” (2000, pp. 174-175). Targeted and purposeful mentoring of these future leaders, by their future predecessors, can help save an institution a most precious resource: time.

REFERENCES

- Bosch, E. K., Ramachandran, H., Luevano, S., & Wakiji, E. (2010). The resource team model: An innovative mentoring program for academic librarians. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 16, 57–74. doi:10.1080/13614530903584305
- Cirasella, J., & Smale, M. A. (2011). Peers don't let peers perish: Encouraging research and scholarship among junior library faculty. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 3(2), 98–109.
- Culpepper, J. C. (2001). Mentoring academic librarians. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 7(2), 71–81. doi:10.1300/J106v07n02_07
- Dartmouth College Library. (2012). *Peerm mentoring*. Retrieved from <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~library/leo/peer.html>
- Farmer, D., Stockham, M., & Trussell, A. (2009). Revitalizing a mentoring program for academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, 70(1), 8–24.
- Fyn, A. (2013). Peer group mentoring relationships and the role of the narrative. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(4), 330–334. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2012.11.016
- Ghouse, N., & Church-Duran, J. (2008). Mentoring for all: The KU Libraries' experience. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 8(4), 373–386. doi:10.1353/pla.0.0022
- Henrich, K. J., & Attebury, R. (2010). Communities of practice at an academic library: A new approach to mentoring at the University of Idaho. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(2), 158–165. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2010.01.007
- Ivy, K. (2013). *LAUCH-R future librarians and information specialist mentor program*. Retrieved from <http://library.ucr.edu/?view=laucr/other/>
- Keener, M., Johnson, V., & Collins, B. L. (2012). In-house collaborative mentoring. *College & Research Libraries News*, 73(3), 134–146.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, & Company.
- Kupyer-Rushing, L. (2001). A formal mentoring program in a university library: Components of a successful experiment. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(6), 440–446. doi:10.1016/S0099-1333(01)00258-0
- Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Lee, D. (2005). Mentoring the untenured librarian. *College & Research Libraries News*, 66(10), 711–724.
- Lee, M. K. (2011). *Mentoring in the library: Building for the future*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

- Lieberthal, S. P. (2009). Perspectives on peer support for tenure-track librarians: The annual juniors retreat at Stony Brook University. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 1(2), 30–47.
- Mavrinnac, M. A. (2005). Transformational leadership: Peer mentoring as a values-based learning process. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 391–404. doi:10.1353/pla.2005.0037
- Munde, G. (2000). Beyond mentoring: Moving toward the rejuvenation of academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 26(3), 171–175. doi:10.1016/S0099-1333(00)00095-1
- Murphy, S. A. (2008). Developmental relationships in the dynamic library environment: Re-conceptualizing mentoring for the future. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(5), 434–437. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2008.06.006
- Neyer, L., & Yelinek, K. (2011). Beyond boomer meets NextGen: Examining mentoring practices among Pennsylvania academic librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(3), 215–221. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2011.02.013
- University of Delaware Library Assembly of Professional Staff. (2009). *Mentoring program guidelines and procedures*. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.udel.edu/udlaps/activities/mentoring.htm>
- University of Minnesota Libraries. (2011). *Mentoring: The role of the institutional mentor*. Retrieved from <https://www.lib.umn.edu/sed/institute/mentoring>
- University of Toronto Libraries. (2013). *Mentoring interest group @ UTL*. Retrieved from <http://guides.library.utoronto.ca/peer-mentoring>
- Wayman, M. J., Walker, B. E., & Shank, J. D. (2011). The Pennsylvania State University Libraries administrative leadership development program: A proposal. In T. Diamond (Ed.), *Middle management in academic and public libraries* (pp. 69–86). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.
- Wilson, M. C., Gaunt, M. I., & Tehrani, F. (2008). Mentoring programs in U.S. academic libraries: A literature review. In J. Varlejs & G. Walton (Eds.), *Strategies for regenerating the library and information professions: Eighth world conference on continuing professional development and workplace learning for the library and information professions* (pp. 84–95). The Hague, The Netherlands: IFLA Publications.
- Wittkopf, B. (1999). *Mentoring programs in ARL libraries*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries Office of Leadership and Management Services.
- Wojewodzki, C., Stein, L., & Richardson, T. (1998). Formalizing an informal process: Developing a mentoring program in a university library. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 15(3), 1–19. doi:10.1300/J124v15n03_01
- Zabel, D. (2008). The mentoring role of professional associations. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 13(3), 349–361. doi:10.1080/08963560802183187

ADDITIONAL READING

- Arnold, J., Nickel, L. T., & Williams, L. (2008). Creating the next generation of library leaders. *New Library World*, 109(9-10), 444–456. doi:10.1108/03074800810910478
- Bollard, S. D. (2013). Mentoring in the 21st century. *Knowledge Quest*, 41(4), 4–5.
- Bower, J. L. (2007). Solve the succession crisis by growing inside-outside leaders. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(11), 90–96. PMID:18159789
- Bunnett, B., Allee, N., Dorsch, J., Rios, G., & Stewart, C. (2009). The national library of Medicine/Association of academic health sciences libraries (NLM/AAHSL) leadership fellows program: A year in review. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(8), 869–879. doi:10.1080/01930820903397200
- Carle, D. O., Ericson, C., & Powell, K. D. (2013). Un-mentoring in the last frontier. *College & Research Libraries News*, 74(1), 10–13.
- Chapman, C. (2009). Retention begins before day one: Orientation and socialization in libraries. *New Library World*, 110(3/4), 122–135. doi:10.1108/03074800910941329
- Cords, S. S. (2013). Forget a mentor, find a sponsor: The new way to fast-track your career. *Library Journal*, 138(14), 122.
- Crossno, J., DeShay, C. H., Ann Huslig, M., Mayo, H. G., & Patridge, E. F. (2012). A case study: The evolution of a facilitator model liaison program in an academic medical library. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 100(3), 171–175. doi:10.3163/1536-5050.100.3.006 PMID:22879805
- Crumpton, M. A. (2011). Mentoring in tough financial times. *Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, 24(1), 51–54. doi:10.1108/08880451111142079
- Doolittle, E. M., Graham, J., Martin, A., Mendelsohn, H., Snowden, K., & Stone, A. (2009). Creating a culture of mentoring @ your library. *Southeastern Librarian*, 57(1), 29–38.
- Edwards, M. B., & Hinchliffe, L. J. (2008). Roles of coaching and mentoring in attracting recruits and socializing entrants to the profession. In J. Varlejs and G. Walton (Eds.). *Strategies for regenerating the library and information professions: Eighth world conference on continuing professional development and workplace learning for the library and information professions. 18-20 August 2009, Bologna, Italy* (pp. 96-108). The Hague: IFLA Publications.
- Emelo, R. (2008). Knowledge networks. *Chief Learning Officer*, 7(5), 22–22.
- Focht, M. M. (2011). Growing new professionals through mentorship: A two way street. *Visual Resources Association Bulletin*, 38(3), 1–5.
- Freedman, S. (2009). Effective mentoring. *IFLA Journal*, 35(2), 171–182. doi:10.1177/0340035209105672
- Gaffney, S. (2005). Career development as a retention and succession planning tool. *Journal for Quality and Participation*, 28(3), 7–10.

- German, L., Owen, V., Parchuck, J., & Sandore, B. (2009). RLLF in the rear-view mirror: A report on the impact and value of the ARL academic library leadership fellows program. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(8), 795–809. doi:10.1080/01930820903396780
- Golden, J. (2008). Developing a new approach to partnering in the formal mentoring process. In J. Varlejs and G. Walton (Eds.). *Strategies for regenerating the library and information professions: Eighth world conference on continuing professional development and workplace learning for the library and information professions. 18-20 August 2009, Bologna, Italy* (pp. 109-125). The Hague: IFLA Publications.
- Golden, J. (2012). Mentoring as a career strategy for mid-level public library managers: A selective review of literature involving methodology and cross-disciplines. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 1-13.
- Groves, K. S. (2007). Integrating leadership development and succession planning best practices. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(3), 239–260. doi:10.1108/02621710710732146
- Hardesty, L. L. (1997). College library directors mentor program: passing it on: a personal reflection. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 23, 281–290. doi:10.1016/S0099-1333(97)90135-X
- Haynes, R. K., & Ghosh, R. (2008). Mentoring and succession management: An evaluative approach to the strategic collaboration model. *Review of Business*, 28(2), 3–12.
- Hicks, D. (2011). The practice of mentoring: Reflecting on the critical aspects for leadership development. *The Australian Library Journal*, 60(1), 66–74. doi:10.1080/00049670.2011.10722557
- Jacobs, H. L. M., & Berg, S. A. (2013). By librarians, for librarians: Building a strengths-based institute to develop librarians' research culture in Canadian academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(3), 227–231. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2013.02.003
- Johnson, P. (2007). Retaining and advancing librarians of color. *College & Research Libraries*, 68(5), 405–417.
- Keener, M., Johnson, V., & Collins, B. L. (2012). In-house collaborative mentoring. *College & Research Libraries News*, 73(3), 134–146.
- Kirkland, J. (1997). The missing women library directors: Deprivation versus mentoring. *College & Research Libraries*, 58, 376–384.
- Lacy, M., & Copeland, A. J. (2013). The role of mentorship programs in LIS education and in professional development. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 54(1), 135–146.
- Lipscomb, C. E., Martin, E. R., & Peay, W. J. (2009). Building the next generation of leaders: The NLM/AAHSL leadership fellows program. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(8), 847–867. doi:10.1080/01930820903396970
- Mason, F. M., & Wetherbee, L. V. (2004). Learning to lead: An analysis of current training programs for library leadership. *Library Trends*, 53(1), 187–217.

- McMahon, M. L. (2012). Mentoring in the library: Building for the future. *Theological Librarianship*, 5(1), 89–90.
- Miller, L. N. (2011). Retention initiatives are employed in academic libraries, although not necessarily for this purpose. *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice*, 6(3), 56–58.
- Moran, B. B., Marshall, J. G., & Rathbun-Grubb, S. (2010). The academic library workforce: Past, present, and future. *Library Trends*, 59(1/2), 208–219, 376–377, 379.
- Nixon, J. M. (2008). Growing your own leaders: Succession planning in libraries. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 13(3), 249–260. doi:10.1080/08963560802183229
- Noh, Y. (2010). A study analyzing the career path of librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(4), 329–346. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2010.05.007
- Osif, B. A. (2008). Successful mentoring programs: Examples from within and without the academy. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 13(3), 335–347. doi:10.1080/08963560802183096
- Parker, C. A. (2009). Leadership development programs for law librarians. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(8), 881–885. doi:10.1080/01930820903397218
- Robbeloth, H., Eng, A., & Weiss, S. (2013). Disconnect between literature and libraries: The availability of mentoring programs for academic librarians. *Endnotes: The Journal of the New Membership Round Table*, 4(1), 1–19.
- Sayers, R., & Talve, A. (2009). Looking beyond the horizon: Founding an executive leadership program for senior library managers in Australasia. *Library Management*, 30(8-9), 509–523. doi:10.1108/01435120911006485
- Saylor, N., Wolfe, J., & Soderdahl, P. (2011). Mentoring, it's a good thing. *College & Research Libraries News*, 72(10), 566–570.
- Shenkman, M. H. (2005). Manage for today, mentor for tomorrow. *Nonprofit World*, 23(5), 28–30.
- Slagell, J., & Holtermann, J. (2007). . . . *The Serials Librarian*, 52(3/4), 271–275. doi:10.1300/J123v52n03_04
- Strothmann, M., & Ohler, L. A. (2011). Retaining academic librarians: By change or by design? *Library Management*, 3(32), 191–208. doi:10.1108/01435121111112907
- Warren, V. (2011). Using workforce structures to enable staff retention and development: An academic library case study. *New Library World*, 112(1-2), 8–18. doi:10.1108/03074801111100427
- Wasburn, M. H., & Crispo, A. W. (2006). Strategic collaboration: Developing a more effective mentoring model. *Review of Business*, 27(1), 18–25.
- Webster, D. E., & Young, D. J. (2009). Our collective wisdom: Succession planning and the ARL research library leadership fellows program. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(8), 781–793. doi:10.1080/01930820903396764

Yusuf, F. (2011). Mentoring and its impact on the publication output of librarians in selected academic libraries in south-west Nigeria. *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science*, 21(2), 113–120.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Advancement: The process by which current employees move up in an organizational hierarchy.

Mentoring: A relationship of support, socialization, and guidance.

Orientation: The process by which a new employee acculturates into an institution.

Peer Mentoring: Either a formal or informal relationship between equals in a pair or a group.

Promotion: Passing a peer review process to move up a rank in one's current position.

Retention: The process by which current employees remain in an organization.

Traditional Mentoring: A formal relationship between two persons, one experienced and one novice.

APPENDIX

List of Nine Institutions for which Mentoring Program Documentation was Included in Wittkopf's (1999) *Mentoring Programs in ARL Libraries*

- Arizona State University
- Colorado State University
- University of Delaware
- Johns Hopkins University
- Indiana University
- Louisiana State University
- University of New Mexico
- State University of New York at Albany
- Ohio State University

List of 18 Institutions for which Mentoring Program Documentation was Publicly Available on their Websites (September 2013)

- Auburn University
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of California, Riverside
- University of California, San Diego
- Cornell University
- Dartmouth College
- University of Delaware
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Illinois at Chicago
- Indiana University
- University of Minnesota
- Ohio State University
- Rutgers University
- University of Southern California
- Syracuse University
- University of Toronto